



# UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE  
United States Patent and Trademark Office  
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS  
P.O. Box 1450  
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450  
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/458,820	12/13/1999	WUPING DONG	FUJI-111	9320
23995	7590	07/29/2005	EXAMINER	
RABIN & Berdo, PC 1101 14TH STREET, NW SUITE 500 WASHINGTON, DC 20005			PASS, NATALIE	
			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
			3626	
DATE MAILED: 07/29/2005				

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

<b>Office Action Summary</b>	Application No.	Applicant(s)
	09/458,820	DONG, WUPING
	Examiner Natalie A. Pass	Art Unit 3626

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

#### Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

#### Status

- 1) Responsive to communication(s) filed on 28 April 2005.
- 2a) This action is FINAL.                                    2b) This action is non-final.
- 3) Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

#### Disposition of Claims

- 4) Claim(s) 1-6 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are allowed.
- 6) Claim(s) 1-6 is/are rejected.
- 7) Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are objected to.
- 8) Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

#### Application Papers

- 9) The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) The drawing(s) filed on \_\_\_\_\_ is/are: a) accepted or b) objected to by the Examiner.  
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).  
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

#### Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).  
a) All    b) Some \* c) None of:
  1. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
  2. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. \_\_\_\_\_.
  3. Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

\* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

#### Attachment(s)

1) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)	4) <input type="checkbox"/> Interview Summary (PTO-413)
2) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)	Paper No(s)/Mail Date: _____
3) <input type="checkbox"/> Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08) Paper No(s)/Mail Date: _____	5) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)
	6) <input type="checkbox"/> Other: _____

**DETAILED ACTION**

***Notice to Applicant***

1. This communication is in response to the amendment filed 28 April 2005. Claims 1-6 have been amended. Claims 1-6 remain pending.

***Specification***

2. The objection to the specification to 35 U.S.C. 132 because it introduces new matter into the disclosure is hereby withdrawn due to the amendment filed 28 April 2005.

***Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 112***

3. The rejection of claims 1-6 under 35 U.S.C. 112, first paragraph, for introducing new matter is hereby withdrawn due to the amendment filed 28 April 2005.
4. The rejection of claim 1 under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph, for being indefinite is hereby withdrawn due to the amendment filed 28 April 2005.

***Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103***

5. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

6. Claims 1-2, 5-6 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Hunt (U.S. Patent 5,781,892), and Garback (U.S. Patent 5,237,499) and further in view of Rangan (U.S. Patent 6,412, 073) for substantially the same reasons given in the previous Office Action (paper number 12292004), and further in view of Vance et al., (U.S. Patent 6, 442,526). Further reasons appear hereinbelow.

(A) Claim 1 has been amended to recite

- "net server and an issuing terminal interconnected to said net server via a local area network, said issuing terminal," in the preamble;
- "net server," in lines 11, 14, 18, 30, 34, and 38;
- "home page addresses," in lines 12-13, 17, 19, and 22;
- "the booking data of the predetermined format including the booking number," in line 35;
- "storing a received booking data in said net server, and sending said booking number included in the received booking data to said issuing terminal from said net server," in lines 40-42; and
- "receiving, in said issuing terminal, ticket issuing data from the selected external reservation system to issue," in lines 47-49.

As per newly amended claim 1, Hunt, Garback and Rangan teach a method of an intranet ticket booking and issuing system as analyzed and discussed in the previous Office Action (paper number 12292004) including a net server and an issuing terminal interconnected to said net server via a local area network (Hunt: Figure 1, Items 12, 14 and 22, Figure 2, column 2, lines 11-29, column 3 lines 32-61, column 4 lines 16-28) and comprising

sending “terminal addresses” (reads on “home page addresses”) from “gateway process 50” (reads on “said net server” to said personal computer (Hunt: column 4 line 67 to col. 5 line 2; column 7 lines 5-56);

storing in said personal computer the home page addresses sent from said net server into a memory and displaying information corresponding to the home page addresses relating to said external reservation systems on a screen for selection by the user (Hunt: Figure 2, column 4 lines 16-37, column 6, line 40 to column 7, line 56), (Rangan; Figure 2, Figure 3, column 2, lines 10-20);

reading out the home page address of the selected external reservation system from memory (Rangan; Figure 2, Figure 3, Abstract, column 2, lines 10-20, column 4, lines 52-60, column 5, lines 35-44);

completing a booking through the website, without the aid of said net server via the Internet (Rangan; Figure 2, column 1, lines 51-60, column 2, lines 10-20, column 4, lines 52-60);

sending the booking data to said net server , the booking data of the predetermined format including the “confirmation number” (reads on “booking number”) (Garback; Figure 1, Figure 4, column 3, lines 5-10, column 5, line 56 to column 6, line 10, column 7, lines 26-30);

Although Hunt teaches "FIG. 2 illustrates a general purpose computer...that can be used for client computers ... or server computers ..." and "[d]ata ... used by computer .. may be stored in memory ..., tape drive ..., optical storage ..., and/or disk drive ... ,” (Hunt; column 4, lines 15-19) Hunt, Garback and Rangan fail to explicitly disclose

storing a received booking data in said net server, and sending said booking number included in the received booking data to said issuing terminal from said net server; and receiving, in said issuing terminal, ticket issuing data from the selected external reservation system to issue the ticket.

However, the above features are well-known in the art, as evidenced by Vance.

In particular, Vance teaches

storing a received booking data in said net server, and sending "pre-trip booking data" (reads on "said booking number included in the received booking data") to said issuing terminal from said net server (Vance; Figure 1, Figure 14U, column 4, lines 1-37); and receiving, in said issuing terminal, ticket issuing data from the selected external reservation system to issue the ticket (Vance; Figure 1, Figure 14U, column 4, lines 1-37).

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to modify the method of Hunt, Garback and Rangan to include storing a received booking data in said net server, and sending said booking number included in the received booking data to said issuing terminal from said net server; and receiving, in said issuing terminal, ticket issuing data from the selected external reservation system to issue the ticket, as taught by Vance, with the motivations of providing a corporate travel planning and management system which operates on a corporate database environment that allows automated travel planning from

a corporate traveler's desktop, pre-travel decision support to inform a corporation of planned travel expenditures before corporate dollars are spent (Vance; column 2, lines 36-42).

The remainder of claim 1 is rejected for the same reasons given in the prior Office Action (paper number 12292004, section 10, pages 5-11), and incorporated herein.

The motivations for combining the respective teachings of Hunt, Garback and Rangan are as given in the rejection of claim 1 in the previous Office Action (paper number 12292004), and incorporated herein.

(B) As per newly amended claim 2, the amended limitations in claim 2 differ from the amended limitations in claim 1 in that, claim 1 contains a method recited as a series of function steps whereas claim 2 contains features recited in a "means-plus-function" format. As the amended method of claim 1 has been shown to be obvious in view of the combined teachings of Hunt, Garback, Rangan and Vance, it is readily apparent that the "means" to accomplish those method steps is obvious in view of the listed citations of the prior art. As such, the amended limitations recited in claim 2 are rejected for the same reasons given above for amended claim 1, and incorporated herein.

The motivations for combining the respective teachings of Hunt, Garback, Rangan and Vance are as given in the rejection of claim 1 above and in the previous Office Action (paper number 12292004) and incorporated herein.

(C) The amendments to claims 5-6 appear to have been made merely to correct minor typographical or grammatical errors. While these changes render the language of the claims smoother and more consistent, they otherwise affect neither the scope and breadth of the claims as

originally presented nor the manner in which the claims were interpreted by the Examiner when applying prior art within the previous Office Action.

As such, the recited claimed features are rejected for the same reasons given in the prior Office Action (paper number 12292004, section 10, page 12), and incorporated herein.

7. Claims 3-4 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Hunt (U.S. Patent 5,781,892), and Garback (5,237,499) Rangan (6,412,073) and Vance et al., (U.S. Patent 6, 442,526), as applied to claims 1 and 2 above, and further in view of Tagawa (5,732,398).

(A) The amendments to claims 3-4 appear to have been made merely to correct minor typographical or grammatical errors. While these changes render the language of the claims smoother and more consistent, they otherwise affect neither the scope and breadth of the claims as originally presented nor the manner in which the claims were interpreted by the Examiner when applying prior art within the previous Office Action.

As such, the recited claimed features are rejected for the same reasons given in the prior Office Action (paper number 12292004, section 11, pages 11-14), and incorporated herein.

#### *Response to Arguments*

8. Applicant's arguments filed 28 April 2005 have been fully considered but they are moot in view of the new ground(s) of rejection.

***Conclusion***

9. The prior art made of record and not relied upon is considered pertinent to Applicant's disclosure. The cited but not applied references Sehr, United States Patent Number 6, 609, 658, Yanai, United States Patent Application Publication 2003/0154169A1, Hosomi, et al., United States Patent Number 6, 091, 823, and Lakritz., United States Patent 6, 526, 426 teach the environment of online travel reservation systems.
10. Applicant's amendment necessitated the new ground(s) of rejection presented in this Office action. Accordingly **THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL**. See MPEP § 706.07(a). Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire THREE MONTHS from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within TWO MONTHS of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the THREE-MONTH shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the date of this final action.

11. **Any response to this final action should be mailed to:**

**Box AF**

Commissioner of Patents and Trademarks  
Washington D.C. 20231

**or faxed to:** (571) 273-8300.

For formal communications, please mark  
"EXPEDITED PROCEDURE".

For informal or draft communications, please  
label "PROPOSED" or "DRAFT" on the front page of

the communication and do NOT sign the communication.

After Final communications should be labeled "Box AF."

12. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Natalie A. Pass whose telephone number is (571) 272-6774. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday through Thursday from 9:00 AM to 6:30 PM. The examiner can also be reached on alternate Fridays.
13. If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Joseph Thomas, can be reached at (571) 272-6776. Any inquiry of a general nature or relating to the status of this application or proceeding should be directed to the Receptionist whose telephone number is (571) 272-3600. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 703-872-9306.
14. Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

  
Natalie A. Pass

July 18, 2005

  
JOSEPH THOMAS  
SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER  
TECHNOLOGY CENTER 3600